2003. The examiner then lists the same objections regarding Arnold *et al* in this office action as he gave in the previous office action dated 5 March 2003. Applicant is surprised that the Examiner has not considered the amendments made to the claims and the arguments submitted with the response of 4 June 2003. On this basis, the Examiner has neither raised any new objections regarding Arnold *et al* nor has the Examiner commented on the merits of Applicant's previous arguments.

In relation to the amended claims, Applicant notes that Arnold *et al* merely discloses the passing of data and parameters between a client 302 and a server 316. The data is marshalled by a remote stub 310 in the client and is "unmarshalled" in a remote skeleton 322 in the server 316. Thus no software code is stored in a message passing between the client and server but rather data and parameters to be processed jointly by the remote stub and remote skeleton and ultimately by the remote computer method 320 (see for example column 6 lines 9 to 11, lines 17 to 19 and lines 29 to 30).

It is noted therefore that Arnold does not teach or suggest "storing computer software code in a . . . message". As acknowledged also by the Examiner, Arnold is not concerned with SIP messages. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that claim 1 is inventive over Arnold.

Applicant notes that, after raising the objections relating to Arnold *et al* based on the unamended claims, the Examiner goes on to argue that "Additionally, Handley *et al* discloses the storing of computer software code (SIP URL) in a SIP message that can be sent from a first SIP client to a second SIP client". This argument was not raised in the office action dated 5 March 2003, and appears to relate to the amendments Applicant filed on 4 June 2003. On this basis, the Examiner is seemingly considering the claim amendments made to the claims filed Applicant's response of 4 June 2003 in relation to Handley *et al*, having chosen to ignore them in relation to Arnold *et al*. As discussed, Applicant finds this surprising.

In regard to the Examiner's new argument relating to Handley *et al*, it is respectfully submitted that those skilled in the art would not consider a SIP URL to be "computer software code" that is stored in a SIP message. A URL is simply a location address on a network comprising no more that a set of characters. It is respectfully submitted that a URL

2

does not and could not perform any function other than provide a location address. Furthermore, a URL does not have any of the well recognised characteristics of "computer software code". In addition, even if a URL was considered to be "computer software code" (which we strongly dispute), a URL cannot be "executed" as required by Claim 1. An URL merely provides a location address in a network.

It is respectfully submitted that Handley et al discloses only the notion of a message body in a SIP message, with a SIP URL. The portion referred to by the Examiner of RFC 2543, does not propose the storage of software code within the SIP message.

Thus it is submitted that the combination of teachings of Arnold et al and Handley et al fails to disclose the recited feature of storing software code in a SIP message.

For similar reasons (and following corresponding amendments filed with Applicant's response of 4 June 2003) it is submitted that claims 20, 24, 26, 27, 30, 31, 32 and 33 are also non-obvious over Arnold et al in view of Handley et al.

The remaining claims all depend from one of the aforementioned independent claims and are therefore also non-obvious at least by virtue of their dependencies.

The rejection under USC § 103 is therefore respectfully traversed.